



FY 2009

**Contractor Performance Evaluation and
Measurement Plan**

for

***Management and Operations of the
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center***



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR’S PERFORMANCE Rating.....	3
II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	7
BACKGROUND.....	7
PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	7
GOAL 1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT.....	7
1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT	
ON THE FIELD.....	8
1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	9
1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	
& GOALS.....	9
1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF PRODUCTS.....	10
GOAL 2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION,	
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES.....	13
2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT	
LABORATORY PROGRAMS (i.e.; activities leading to CD-2).....	14
2.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.....	15
2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES.....	15
2.4 UTILIZATION OF FACILITY TO GROW AND SUPPORT LAB’S RESEARCH	
BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY.....	17
GOAL 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	20
3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC	
CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION.....	20
3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	
PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.....	21
3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND	
RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS.....	22
Attachment I SLAC FY2009 APPRAISAL WEIGHT SHEET.....	25
GOAL 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPLETE LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF	
THE LABORATORY.....	26
4.1 PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND AN	
EFFECTIVE PLAN FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE	
STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS.....	26
4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP	
THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION.....	27
4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS	
APPROPRIATE.....	28
GOAL 5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED	
SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	30
5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE	
ENVIRONMENT.....	30
5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED	
SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT.....	31
5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT,	
MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION.....	32
GOAL 6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS	
AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE	
LABORATORY MISSION(S).....	34
6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL	

	MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S).....	34
6.2	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	34
6.3	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	35
6.4	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM.....	36
6.5	PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND, OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE.....	36
6.6	DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS.....	37
GOAL 7.0	SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS.....	39
7.1	MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE, MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS AND ENSURES SITE CAPABILITY TO MEET MISSION NEEDS.....	39
7.2	PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND GROWTH OF LABORATORY MISSIONS AND PROGRAM.....	39
GOAL 8.0	SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARD AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.....	41
8.1	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	41
8.2	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER- SECURITY.....	41
8.3	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND PROPERTY.....	42
8.4	PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION.....	42
Attachment II	FY2009 APPENDIX B PROGRAM OFFICE SCORE FOR EACH GOAL (STANFORD LINEAR ACCELERATOR CENTER).....	44

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) primarily serves DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of *Stanford University* (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the *Stanford Linear Accelerator Center* (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Stanford Site Office (SSO). This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor will be determined.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING

The FY 2009 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A). Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives, and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determine the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.) may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details "for example at the A, C+, and D level" and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
		potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Figure I-1 Letter Grade and Numerical Score DefinitionsCalculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score.

Utilizing the raw numerical score for each Goal within Table A, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall raw score for each. The total score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations is compared to the letter grade scale found in Table B, to determine the overall S&T and M&O grades for FY 2009.

As stated above, the raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. A standard routing convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			TBD%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			TBD%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			TBD%		
Total Score					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			25%		
6.0 Business Systems			25%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			15%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			10%		
Total Score					

Table A. FY 2008 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0

Table B. FY 2008 Contractor Letter Grade Scale/Numeric Score ScaleAdjustment to the Letter Grade:

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the contract. Data to support rating adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational

awareness (daily oversight) activities; “For Cause” reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.).

The final Contractor performance-based grade for each Goal will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating based on Performance Goal achievements.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor’s performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2009.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external Recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE’s mission of protecting our national and economic security by

providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC) Program Offices as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1).

Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) <1%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 70%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 29%

Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) <1%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
B+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor “guessed right” in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Laboratory staffs lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
B+	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
B	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs That Advance Program Objectives & Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversights, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc) output(s) be it policy, R&D or implementation programs;

- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of work.
B+	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
B	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall project/project if not corrected.
D	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through progress reports, peer-reviews; Field Work Proposals (FWP's), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWP's and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises, and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

Grade	Performance
A to A +	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are met, minor delays, overruns and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact on the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the

	scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. less than 6 months behind) and/or with the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays overruns and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Science Program Office¹	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall HEP Total					

¹ A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

Table 1.1-1.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			<1%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			70%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			29%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development²

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 1.3 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

² Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY2009.

2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities

The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge research facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC), other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 75%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) < 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 25%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.2). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 2.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC) Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B ⁺ , the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE apprised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
B+	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plan (AFP), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and

- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.
B⁺	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low, beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations. The facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, <u>or</u> the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, <u>or</u> the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state and/or the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor's ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Reviews document how multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach programs is in place.
B⁺	Reviews state strong and effective team approach exists toward establishing large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach programs is in place.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office³	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			15%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			55%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			20%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			40%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			60%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
Overall HEP Total					

Table 2.1 – 2.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			75%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			25%		
Overall Program Office Total					

Table 2.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁴

³ A complete listing of S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 2.3 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter

⁴ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, Program Offices as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) <1%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 70%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 29%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) <1%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
B+	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
C	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
D	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
F	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and user facility strategic plans;
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B⁺	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal & external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives <i>always</i> initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
B⁺	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office⁵	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
Overall HEP Total					
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall WDTs Total					

Table 3.1 – 3.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			<1%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			70%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			29%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
Overall Program Office Total					

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁶

⁵ A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

⁶ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY2009.

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 3.3 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

Office of Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

ATTACHMENT I

SLAC FY2009 Appraisal Weight Sheet		ASCR	BES	BER	HEP	WDTS
		Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment						
	Goal's weight	80	15	10	35	65
1.1 Impact (significance)		40	50	30	30	25
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30	20	20	30	30
1.3 Output (productivity)		15	15	20	20	30
1.4 Delivery		15	15	30	20	15
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities						
	Goal's weight	0	65	65	35	0
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		0	15	0	40	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		0	55	0	0	0
2.3 Operation of Facility		0	20	90	60	0
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community		0	10	10	0	0
Goal 3.0 Program Management						
	Goal's weight	20	20	25	30	35
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	40	20	40	20
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	40	40
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	20	40

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

This Goal measures the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measured the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Quality and applicability of the Vision developed by/for the Laboratory to DOE's Strategic Plans, including the identification of distinctive characteristics regarding the future of SLAC science.
- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan as presented to Office of Science.
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan is defined by the SLAC Agenda for achieving the approved Laboratory vision.
- Demonstrated ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities.
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advances the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

The weight of this Objective is 34%.

- 4.1.1 SLAC develops and implements a compelling strategic vision that capitalizes on its core competencies consistent with and driving the DOE strategic plan.

Target 4.1.1.1 SLAC develops Business Plan that meaningfully differentiates itself from its scientific competitors in the ten-year timeframe, acquires and incorporates DOE feedback on that plan, and manages the plan implementation via the SLAC Agenda.

- 4.1.2 SLAC Director conducts progress reviews of the SLAC Agenda at the ALD and Operations Leadership Meetings and ensures alignment of the Operations activities to the Mission of the Lab by creating Operations Business Plans and managing and monitoring progress against those plans. SLAC demonstrates that laboratory staff understands and are aligned with the SLAC agenda.
- 4.1.3 Operations-wide and individual Division/Department meetings are conducted at least quarterly to ensure appropriate prioritization, planning and progress for efficient operations.
- 4.1.4 A formal integrated planning and budgeting system is institutionalized which is responsive to SLAC and DOE in carrying out the lab's mission.

- 4.1.5 SLAC develops and implements strong partnerships with key stakeholders, collaborators and customers that furthers the mission of the laboratory and leverages DOE resources.

Target 4.1.5.1 SLAC actively participate in the National Laboratory Directors Council (NLDC) and working groups, DOE/SC Forum, SC Policy Planning Process, develops collaborations with other Laboratories, nationally and internationally, and works to improve integration with Stanford University in both science and operations activities. Stanford and SLAC Director regularly and routinely communicate with national decision makers.

- 4.1.6 SLAC develops and implements an effective community, public, and stakeholder communication and involvement plan.

Target 4.1.6.1 A SLAC Tours Program, reflecting the modern Laboratory, is reinstated by July 1, 2009

Target 4.1.6.2 SLAC implements a best-in-class public web site not later than June 1, 2009.

Target 4.1.6.3 SLAC's outreach program regularly and effectively provides information concerning the vision, mission, major activities, and potential impacts to the community and issues a "Communication and Involvement Plan" acceptable to the SSO not later than August 1, 2009.

4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Leadership to include Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership, to include Corporate Office Leadership, in identifying and/corresponding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

The weight of this Objective is 33%.

- 4.2.1 SLAC develops and implements Roles, Responsibilities, Authorities and Accountabilities program representative of all Lab Leadership and Management positions and instills accountability in Line Management to the extent that accountability is visible, acknowledged and improved.
- 4.2.2 There is frequent (at least monthly) communication from Lab Senior Leadership articulating the core value of safety in accomplishing SLAC's mission and vision and staff are able to reflect the value that Lab Management expects the safe accomplishment of the SLAC mission.
- 4.2.3 Lab leadership and management engage staff regarding safety by monthly walkarounds, conducted by ALD's at least 11 out of 12 months.
- 4.2.4 Lab leadership clearly demonstrates that Integrated Safety and Environmental Management System (ISEMS) is effectively implemented not later than August 31, 2009 throughout the organization resulting in measurable improvements in safety and environmental stewardship.
- 4.2.5 Senior management articulates and executes the laboratory mission such that the entire lab is focused on accomplishing the critical mission activities and actively manages risks and issues in real time.
- 4.2.6 SLAC develops a robust understanding of its *cost of doing business* identifying major cost pools and primary cost drivers and uses this information to target meaningful cost reductions in at least four key program support areas.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Corporate Office involvement in and support of business and other infrastructure process and procedure improvements;
- Establishing joint appointments that are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Laboratory;
- Corporate Office is involved in the infrastructure improvement at the Laboratory; and
- Corporate Office provides staff, expert advice, management systems, or similar assistance to achieve SLAC's Mission.
- Corporate Leadership maintains a sense of the Laboratory (knowledge of significant progress and issues) and acts to ensure the resolution of significant issues.
- Demonstrated added value by Stanford University, including Board of Trustees in managing the SLAC contract will be a factor in assessing the level of corporate leadership. Effective involvement is important.

The weight of this Objective is 33%.

- 4.3.1 SU, through its Board of Overseers provides effective assurance of SLAC and SLAC Management provides effective self-assessment.

Target 4.3.1.1 SU provides an Annual Assurance Letter to DOE. The Board of Overseers validates SLAC Self Assessment program is effectively implemented. SLAC and SU coordinate their Self Assessment and Assurance functions to ensure optimized productivity.

- 4.3.2 SU provides effective and real-time support of the Laboratory.

Target 4.3.2.1 SU is a strategic sourcing partner and is effective in assisting the laboratory recruiting and retaining key Laboratory leadership. SU provides critical staff as needed to supplement SLAC staffing to forward the SLAC mission and ensure effective operations.

- 4.3.3 SU effectively manages strategic issues and assures corrective actions are completed and effective

Target 4.3.3.1 SU provides appropriate levels of resources to assist in the resolution of strategic issues that may impact the Laboratory as well as provides appropriate levels of oversight to ensure key corrective actions are completed as planned and are effective.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			34%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			33%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			33%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1- 4.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 4.2 – 4.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well-deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 25%

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's effectiveness in implementing safety and environmental protection programs that result in significant reductions in worker injuries or illnesses, achieve or make significant progress toward meeting the Office of Science safety goals for Total Recordable Case (TRC) and Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) rates, and eliminate or minimize the potential for releases to the environment. The objectives, goals, and targets supporting this goal focus on some key areas requiring improvement that have been previously identified in Integrated Safety Management (ISM) system reviews of SLAC management systems and work processes. In achieving these objectives, SLAC will be expected to demonstrate tangible improvements in the implementation of the SLAC lessons learned program including, but not limited to, timeliness in reporting of events and occurrences, quality of its causal analysis process and investigation reports, distribution of lessons learned, and implementation of effective systems and processes for identification and tracking of corrective actions. SLAC is also expected to develop and implement more robust fire protection programs that fulfill the expectations and requirements of DOE in this functional area.

SLAC is expected to effectively and efficiently manage and operate the Laboratory through implementation of best-in-class management practices designed to support DOE core research missions while assuring the safety and health of workers and the public and enhancing SLAC programs to protect the environment. SLAC is expected to implement effective and integrated safety and environmental management systems to achieve and maintain excellence in safety and environmental performance. The performance goal, objectives, measures and targets are fundamentally linked to the seven Guiding Principles and five Core Functions of Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS), the ISO 14001 elements and framework of an effective Environmental Management System (EMS) and the specific DOE/Stanford University contract provisions that require SLAC to integrate environment, safety and health into work planning and execution at all organizational levels including flow down to SLAC subcontractors and sub-tier subcontractors. In response to previous ISMS reviews that identified weaknesses in SLAC systems and work processes, SLAC is also expected to focus efforts to develop a more structured and consistent site-wide Work Planning and Control (WPC) process that results in significant improvement in the planning of work activities and identification of hazards and appropriate controls. SLAC is also expected to implement actions that reinforce safe behaviors, encourages reporting of safety issues and concerns, and promotes a culture of accountability.

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Worker Safety, Health and the Environment

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Success in meeting or making significant progress toward the DOE Office of Science safety goals.
- Tangible improvement in the SLAC Lessons Learned Program based on benchmarking results.
- Improved timeliness of incident reporting and quality of causal analysis and investigation reports ; and,
- Development and implementation of improvements in SLAC fire protection programs to meet DOE requirements.

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

5.1.1 SLAC works to meet Office of Science goals for Total Recordable Cases (TRC) and Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART).

Target 5.1.1.1 SLAC will meet the DOE Office of Science TRC goal rate of 0.65

Target 5.1.1.2 SLAC will meet the DOE Office of Science DART goal rate of 0.25.

Target 5.1.1.3 SLAC will continue to improve worker safety by reducing the number of TRC and DART cases by 20% compared to FY2006, FY2007, and FY2008 averages.

- 5.1.2 SLAC implements an effective and efficient Operating Experience Program (OPEX). This program reviews lessons learned from the DOE OPEX database and other sources, appropriately distributes these lessons to relevant workers at SLAC, and tracks any actions taken as a result of these distributions. The following milestones will be achieved in FY2009:

Target 5.1.2.1 SLAC will benchmark other DOE OPEX programs and issue a report enumerating best practices and a corresponding implementation plan by April 1, 2009.

Target 5.1.2.2 SLAC will conduct an Internal Independent Assessment of the OPEX program by September 30, 2009 using the Criteria Review and Approach Document (CRAD) and Letters of Intent (LOI) approach. SLAC will capture and track actions identified from this assessment in CATS.

- 5.1.3 Repeat occurrences of safety incidents are kept to a minimum.

Target 5.1.3.1 SLAC experiences no more than 10% repeat occurrences of an incident (e.g., Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS), TRCs) identified during the previous year.

- 5.1.4 SLAC significantly improves its reporting of events and occurrences.

Target 5.1.4.1 To encourage reporting of all incidents, SLAC's supervisors will provide positive and timely reinforcement of employees in 90% of all reported cases.

Target 5.1.4.2 SLAC will complete the training of a core investigation group, will work with SSO to create a report grading system, and notably improve the quality of ORPS, Noncompliance Tracking System (NTS), and recordable injury reports. This will be evidenced by the final investigation reports having average grades of B+ or better.

- 5.1.5 SLAC achieves best-protected class (Highly Protected Risk) level of fire protection complying with DOE O 420.1B "*Facility Safety*" as applicable.

Target 5.1.5.1 SLAC will begin implementation of DOE O 420.1B Contractor Requirement Documents (CRD) to develop effective fire protection programs. To achieve this, SLAC will submit an implementation plan to SSO for approval by October 30, 2008 and then meet all FY'09 milestones in the implementation plan.

5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management.

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Effective implementation of ISM at all organizational levels.
- Development and implementation of a consistent and site-wide work planning and control process and utilization of improved hazard identification and work authorization processes; and,
- Observations of safe work behavior, degree of reporting of safety issues and concerns, and culture of accountability at all organizational levels.

The weight of this Objective is 50 %.

- 5.2.1 SLAC implements and operates to a Plan-of-the Week for major activities across the laboratory.

- 5.2.2 SLAC develops a comprehensive WPC process and delivers Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment training to improve effectiveness of work planning.

- 5.2.3 SLAC streamlines and improves safety programs for high hazard work implemented through plans (such as Fall Protection plans) and permits (such as Hot Work permits, Excavation permits, penetration permits, etc.) as validated by routine assessments by SSO.
- 5.2.4 SLAC develops and implements a positive recognition and feedback program where safety is viewed as a positive attribute; safe behaviors are reinforced; reporting is encouraged; and accountability becomes a cultural value.

5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Continuous improvement in the implementation and performance of the SLAC Environmental Management System (EMS); and,
- Demonstrate progress in developing, monitoring and achieving site-specific environmental stewardship, energy and transportation goals, objectives, and measurable targets to promote compliance with the requirements of Executive Order 13423 and DOE Orders 450.1A and 430.2B.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

- 5.3.1 SLAC continues to assess the effectiveness of site-wide implementation of Environmental Management System (EMS) and demonstrate continual improvement.

Target 5.3.1.1 SLAC will continue to implement improvements to the site-wide EMS and score an average grade of C or better on the EMS scorecard (note that Grade D is the highest grade).

- 5.3.2 SLAC demonstrates compliance with the requirements of DOE Order 450.1A, "Environmental Protection Program."

Target 5.3.2.1 SLAC will complete the on-time declaration of EMS implementation, by June 30, 2009.

- 5.3.3 SLAC develops site-specific goals, objectives and measurable targets to promote compliance with Executive Order 13423, DOE Orders 450.1A and 430.2B, and monitors progress.

Target 5.3.3.1 SLAC will develop site-specific goals, objectives and measurable targets to promote compliance with DOE Executive Order 13423, DOE Orders 450.1A and 430.2B and submit documentation to SSO on SLAC's progress in meeting the goals, objectives and targets.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			40%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			50%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			10%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5.1 – 5.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 5.2 – 5.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)

The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s).

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective and Responsive Financial Management System(s)

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- SLAC financial management systems' effectiveness as validated by internal {Stanford University (SU) Internal Audit Department (SIAD)} and external audits and reviews {Inspector General (IG), General Accounting Office (GAO)}, and DOE, and other external reviewers;
- SLAC's continual improvement of their financial management system through self-assessments;
- SLAC's financial management system process reporting expectations for timely, accurate, and complete financial reporting;
- SLAC's effective budget management and execution;
- SLAC's effective management of direct and indirect costs; and
- SLAC's financial policy and procedures.

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

6.1.1 SLAC develops and implements a plan to bring its accounting and financial systems/processes up to date with best practices and techniques in accordance with the milestones established for updating SLAC's enterprise resource planning systems. Initial milestones are, 1) SLAC completes the phase one initial feasibility study by the end of 1Q09, and 2) SLAC completes the phase 2 situational analysis by the end of 4Q09.

6.1.2 SLAC submits complete and accurate recurring and monthly accounting and financial data to DOE and the Site Office, as appropriate, according to the schedule established between SLAC and SSO/DOE.

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The continued certification of the procurement system.
- Demonstration of efficient and effective acquisition management system(s) support.
- The effectiveness of the acquisition management system(s) through the use of the results of audits, review, corrective action plans, and other information.

- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

- 6.2.1 SLAC shall develop and implement a comprehensive plan that is acceptable to SSO by December 30, 2008 that systematically improves the acquisition process.
- 6.2.2 SLAC shall implement by December 30, 2008 a system to ensure quality of the award and administration of subcontracts. The system shall be a documented process that describes all phases of subcontract management. The system shall include a process to track payments and invoices ensuring that funds are available.

Quarterly, the laboratory shall report on the implementation of their quality system. The report shall be submitted to SSO 15 days after the end of the second quarter and thereafter.

- 6.2.3 Perform Procurement Balanced Score Card (BSC) evaluation in accordance with the FY2009 BSC Plan and successfully meet at least 90% of the BSC targets.

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The continued certification of the property management system.
- Demonstration of efficient and effective property management system support.
- The effectiveness of the property management system through the use of the results of audits, review, corrective action plans, and other information.
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 15%

- 6.3.1 SLAC shall ensure property is safeguarded and utilized in a cost efficient and effective manner. SLAC shall meet at least 90% of the Property Balanced Score Card targets.
- 6.3.2 Demonstration of successful control of laptop computers. Provide DOE with a quarterly report regarding the loss of laptops. This report should:
- Target 6.3.2.1 include a trending analysis compared to prior FY losses (at a minimum, FY08 shall be included),
- Target 6.3.2.2 include an analysis on causes for the losses, identifying trends, and highlight deficiencies, if any, in the current system,
- Target 6.3.2.3 identify corrective action(s) taken to minimize losses, and
- Target 6.3.2.4 provide employee check-out process for termination.

6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective human resources management system support;
- The effectiveness of the human resources management system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of the human resources management system through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

- 6.4.1 SLAC HR, working with line management, implements generic Role, Responsibility, Authority and Accountability (R2A2s) documents for the Lab which will then be integrated with a current job description and position summaries for each SLAC employee. Final documents will be 95% completed by February 28, 2009.
- 6.4.2 SLAC shall document and complete a comparison of its current compensation system policies, procedures and practices with the requirements of FAR 31.205-6 and DEAR 970.3102-05-6 "Compensation for Personal Services" (Total Compensation System) by July 31, 2009 to the Contracting Officer.
- 6.4.3 An Employee Benefits Value Study (Ben-Val) which is an actuarial study of the relative value (RV) of the benefits programs offered by SLAC measured against the RV benefits program offered by comparator companies approved the Contracting Officer shall be completed by the SLAC. To the extent that the values studies do not address post retirement benefits other than pensions, SLAC shall provide a separate cost and plan design data comparison for post retirements benefits other than pensions using external benchmarks derived from nationally recognized and Contracting Officer approved survey sources. Shall be completed by June 30, 2009.
- 6.4.4 The Laboratory will conduct workforce planning, documented in the form of a plan, and submit it to the Contracting Officer for review and approval. The Plan will identify critical skills necessary to meet mission and contract requirements, provide an updated gap analysis, and outline that year's strategy for the recruitment and retention of those skills, as well as for any necessary restructuring.
- 6.4.5 SLAC establishes accountability for diversity within each of its Directorates by requiring specific plans to increase and maintain diversity within the Directorate. The plans will be in place by January 2, 2009.

6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate

Determination of the (Stanford University) provision of an efficient, effective, and responsive financial management system (s) for internal audit and oversight, quality, information management, and other administrative support systems will be based upon SLAC's implementation of DOE directions, guidelines, and recommendations; and the reliance on the work of others, particularly the Stanford University Audit Department (SIAD), to accomplish overall assessments of the design and operation of internal controls for these various areas, in the determination of effectiveness for these management system.

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective management systems support;
- The effectiveness of the management systems as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of management systems through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.
- The adequacy and compliance of SLAC's Cost Accounting Disclosure Statement.

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

6.5.1 SLAC develops and implements a plan of action to update the enterprise resource planning systems. Milestones are established and deliverables are achieved within the timeframe allotted. Initial milestones are, 1) SLAC completes the phase one initial feasibility study by the end of 1Q09, and 2) SLAC completes the phase 2 situational analysis by the end of 4Q09.

6.5.2 Based on Third Party audits/reviews of SLAC internal controls and oversight, SLAC receives no material findings. SLAC will evaluate audit/review results; develop and implement improvements or corrective action plans; and use a tracking system and milestone schedule, as appropriate, to implement recommendations and improve performance. Quarterly, a status report from the tracking system will be submitted to the Contracting Officer.

A material finding is a failure or shortcoming, which is in violation of the contract, applicable laws and regulations, or a violation of internal controls sufficiently large as to cause a serious case of mismanagement, the charging of unallowable costs, or a situation that misstates the facts.

6.5.3 Stanford University Internal Audit Department completes all SLAC audits identified in the approved FY09 audit plan. SU monitors their Observation Recommendation and Management Action Plan and quarterly provides updates to the Contracting Officer.

6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Collaboration with industry and others for the development and potential commercialization of SLAC technologies.
- Technology identification, maturation, and its guidance to wider use beyond SLAC.

The weight of this Objective is 5%.

6.6.1 SLAC will provide statistical profile of collaboration with industry and others, and the expected impact of those collaborations. The profile of the whole set will include number and types of collaborations (CRADAs and WFOAs), types of partners, new versus continuing, and financial data.

Target 6.6.1.1 Five or more newly executed collaborative agreements.

6.6.2 Provide report of data on inventions (including disclosures, patent applications and issued patents), on software (including assertions of copyright) and licensing activities (on-going and new) to DOE/SSO.

Target 6.6.2.1 Report delivered semi-annually to DOE/SSO by April 17, 2009 and September 30, 2009.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			15%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System			40%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System			15%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and responsive Human Resources Management System			10%		
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			5%		
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 6.2 – 6.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs

The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs.

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

The sustained excellence in operating, maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to meet Laboratory needs shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution; and
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets.
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.
- The management of existing facilities including; condition assessments, cleanliness and housekeeping

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

7.1.1 SLAC will execute Facilities Renewal Plan per the published FY2009 schedule.

7.1.2 SLAC will complete clean-up and maintenance of six significant areas on site as agreed to and inspected by SSO.

7.1.3 SLAC will perform a condition assessment of 80% of the SLAC buildings identified in the FY2008 DOE Office of Science Laboratory Plan for SLAC, to determine Mission Readiness by September 30, 2009. The lab will receive credit for assessments performed in FY2007 and FY2008

7.1.4 A plan is developed, approved by DOE and implemented that adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency wide goals of the Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative and the goals set forth in Executive Order 13423.

Target 7.1.4.1 SLAC will develop and implement a plan approved by DOE that will address DOE's goal in meeting Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiatives and the goals per Executive Order 13423 by August 29, 2009.

7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Planning for current and future needs by incorporating the Strategic Plan into the business plan, into the annual operating plan, into the plan of the week, into daily tasks.

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

- 7.2.1 SLAC develops and begins implementation of a planning and assessment system that integrates the Strategic Plan (20 years); into the business plan (5 years); into the annual operation plan/PEMP (1 year); into the plan of the week. SLAC develops a process to tie in 5-year infrastructure planning, facilities renewal, and annual laboratory planning for integrated planning efforts.

Target 7.2.1.1 SLAC develops an acceptable 5-year infrastructure planning process for facilities renewal, and annual laboratory planning by January 30, 2009.

Target 7.2.1.2 SLAC develops and begins implementation of a planning and assessment system that integrates the Strategic Plan; into the business plan; into the annual operation plan/PEMP ; into the plan of the week by June 30, 2009.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 7.2 – 7.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Emergency Management goals and expectations.
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management performance is appropriately demonstrated,
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated; Development and testing of a comprehensive and effective Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP).

The weight of this objective is 30 %.

8.1.1 SLAC provides and implements an effective Emergency Management program per DOE O 151.1C, "Comprehensive Emergency Management System" CRD.

Target 8.1.1.1 SLAC will complete Emergency Planning Hazards Assessments (EPHAs), submit an acceptable Operational Emergency Hazardous Material Program Plan, complete Emergency Response Organization (ERO) training, and conduct a successful ERO exercise by June 30, 2009.

Target 8.1.1.2 Develop and test an effective Continuity of Operations (COOP) plan by September 30, 2009.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations.

The weight of this objective is 40 %.

8.2.1 All Cyber-Security Events are reported and mitigated within established DOE timeframes.

Target 8.2.1.1 100% Cyber-Security Events are reported and mitigated within established DOE timeframes.

8.2.2 Demonstrate an effective Cyber-Security system through external reviews, surveys and inspections.

Target 8.2.2.1 There should be no repeat findings and no significant deficiencies.

8.2.3 Ability to complete corrective actions for reviews in accordance with approved Corrective Action Plans.

Target 8.2.3.1 All significant findings will be tracked on a Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&MS) on a reporting frequency directed by the Site Office.

8.2.4 Employee and Management awareness of their Cyber-Security responsibilities is demonstrated through external reviews, surveys, inspections, and by completion of annual Cyber security training greater than 95%.

Target 8.2.4.1 100% of employees receive annual cyber security training.

8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and Property

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting the protection of Nuclear Materials and Property goals and expectations.
- The Contractor's success in reducing Nuclear Materials and Radioactive Sources from the laboratory.
- Commitment of Laboratory leaders to strong Safeguards performance as appropriately demonstrated.
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of safeguard risk identification, prevention, and control process/activities.

The weight of this objective is 10%.

8.3.1 SLAC develops a plan to reduce the inventory of radioactive materials not currently required for the mission of the Laboratory from the following locations:

- a. Nuclear Materials and Radioactive Sources from RAMSY.
- b. Radioactive Sources from Radiological Calibration Facility.

Target 8.3.1.1 SLAC will submit a draft of a radioactive materials inventory reduction plan to the SSO for review by January 31, 2009, and will submit an acceptable finalized plan by June 30, 2009.

8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Sensitive Information

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting goals and expectations for the protection of sensitive information.
- The identification, marking and protection of sensitive information (e.g., Official Use Only) that has the potential to damage governmental, commercial, or private interests if inappropriately disseminated.
- The Contractor performs a formal assessment of safeguards and security systems for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

The weight of this objective is 20%.

8.4.1 SLAC maintains an effective program to effectively protect sensitive information that continues to benchmark best-in-class.

Target 8.4.1.1 Assess, mitigate, and properly report security events involving protection of sensitive information within the established DOE timeframes.

8.4.2 SLAC's systems shall ensure that there are no releases of PII information.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			30%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			40%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and SLAC Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Sensitive Information			20%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-08	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 8.2 – 8.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

**FY 2009 Appendix B - Program Office Score for each Goal
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center**

	ASCR		BES		BER		HEP		WDTS	
	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight
Goal 1	1		1		1		1		1	
Obj 1.1	1	40%	1	50%	1	30%	1	30%	1	25%
Obj 1.2	1	30%	1	20%	1	20%	1	30%	1	30%
Obj 1.3	1	15%	1	15%	1	20%	1	20%	1	30%
Obj 1.4	1	15%	1	15%	1	30%	1	20%	1	15%
Goal 2	0		1		1		1		0	
Obj 2.1	1	0%	1	15%	1	0%	1	40%	1	0%
Obj 2.2	1	0%	1	55%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Obj 2.3	1	0%	1	20%	1	90%	1	60%	1	0%
Obj 2.4	1	0%	1	10%	1	10%	1	0%	1	0%
Goal 3	1		1		1		1		1	
Obj 3.1	1	30%	1	40%	1	20%	1	40%	1	20%
Obj 3.2	1	40%	1	30%	1	30%	1	40%	1	40%
Obj 3.3	1	30%	1	30%	1	50%	1	20%	1	40%

The weightings are based on FY 2009 Budget Request

Goal 1 Weighting by Funding			
Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$91,532,000	29.39%
BES		\$215,053,000	69.05%
ASCR		\$338,000	0%
WD		\$519,000	0%
BER		\$3,986,000	1.28%
		<u>\$314,428,000</u>	<u>100.00%</u>

Goal 2 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$91,532,000	29.39%
BES		\$215,053,000	69.05%
ASCR		\$338,000	0%
WD		\$519,000	0%
BER		\$3,986,000	1.28%
		\$314,428,000	100.00%

Goal 3 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$91,532,000	29.39%
BES		\$215,053,000	69.05%
ASCR		\$338,000	0%
WD		\$519,000	.0%
BER		\$3,986,000	1.28%
		\$311,428,000	100.00%